



GAU 363.5

IN THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

FEB 05 2002

GROUP 3600

Appn. Number: 09/690,657

Filing Date: 10/17/00

Applicant: Thompson, Thomas C.

Appn. Title: Hurricane Shutter

Examiner: Dorsey, Dennis L.

Mailed December 3, 2001

AMENDMENT A

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 2022

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed 08/02/01, I have included in this response the following:

1. Petition for one month extension to answer office action.
2. Check in the amount of \$55 for one month extension.
3. Corrections to the specifications, including a new Abstract, and request to delete a page 1.
4. Response to claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.
5. Response to claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.
6. Copy of amended claims.
7. Clean copy of amended claims.
8. Certificate of Mailing.
9. Postcard.

Very respectfully,

Thomas C. Thompson

Thomas C. Thompson

01/28/2002 SSITHIB1 00000131 09690657

01 FC:215

55.00 OP

Response:

1. **The applicant respectfully petitions for a one month extension** to answer the Office Action mailed 08/02/01. The original period for response expired 11/02/01. The applicant has enclosed a check for \$55 to extend the deadline to 12/03/01, since 12/02/01 is Sunday.
2. **Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. The abstract is objected to because the application contains two abstracts. The abstract is further objected to because it does not specifically describe the invention as set forth in the claims.** The applicant respectfully requests that the examiner delete both abstracts and insert the enclosed abstract (after the enclosed claims). There must have been an error in copying, as there were doubles of the first and last sheet. The new abstract has proper language and format, and specifically describes the invention as set forth in the claims. There is no new matter in the abstract.
3. **The disclosure is objected to because page 1 is in the specification twice.** The applicant assumes that both page 1's are duplicates. During copying, high humidity may have put two copies together. The applicant respectfully requests that the examiner delete one of the page 1's.
4. **Claims 10-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter and failing to define the invention. The claims are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language.** The applicant used functional and operational language in the claims because the applicant was trying to claim the method of epoxying a cylindrical base into a cylindrical sleeve, that was cut into concrete by a coring drill. The mount mentioned in claims 18-21 is the female attaching mount shown in Fig. 39E, and should not be restricted out. Claim 20 describes the method of attaching the base mount to the attaching mount. The applicant has amended the claims to meet all stated 112 objections and to distinctly claim the stated subject matter of this invention.

5. **Claims 10-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Birs.** Birs teaches all the limitations of the above claims. Birs' nut 11 shown in his Fig. 5 is for attachment to his hurricane panel 5, as is his rivet shown in his Fig. 6. Birs uses bolts 4 for attaching his upper U-rail 3 to the house, as shown on his Fig. 1. The applicant believes that no one has previously used a core-drilled sleeve-hole for the installation of cylindrical bases to a concrete structure. The enclosed amended claims define over Birs' Hurricane Shutter Reinforcement and Method.
6. **The enclosed amended claims read over the cited references.** A clean copy of the amended claims are also enclosed for the examiner's convenience. Accordingly, the applicant submits that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits. If the examiner agrees but does not feel that the present claims are technically adequate, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner write acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j).

7. **Certificate of mailing:**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents,

Washington, D.C. 20231

on 12/3/01

(Date)

Printed name of person signing this certificate:

John R. Thompson

Signature: John R. Thompson

Thomas C. Thompson
92-543 Koko Pl.
MaKaKilo, HI 96707
(808) 672-3107

FAX (808) 672-3107